

REMARKS

Claims 1-24 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 4, 8 and 12 have been amended as a result of this response, and claims 13-24 have been added. Claims 1, 4, 8 and 12 are independent claims.

Personal Interview of May 6, 2003

Initially, Applicants respectfully thank Examiner Nguyen for taking the time to conduct a personal interview with Applicants' representatives on May 6, 2003. During that personal interview, a general agreement was reached. Applicants believe that the present response reflects that agreement.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant acknowledges the Examiner's indication that claims 7 and 11 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. However, Applicants respectfully submit that such an amendment is not necessary since claims 7 and 11 depend from allowable claims, for the reasons set forth below.

35 U.S.C. §102(b) Pryor Rejection

Claims 1-6, 8-10 and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,991,380 to Pryor. This rejection, insofar

as it pertains to the presently pending claims, is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

In the personal interview, Applicants identified one of the patentable features of the present invention as being the dual feedback loop through which the self-bias signal passes. As illustrated in the exemplary embodiment of Fig. 6, the self bias signal is applied to output node O1, transistor P43B, transistor P46, node N1, one or both of transistors P47 and P41, and back to output node O1, thereby forming a first feedback loop.

The self-bias signal also is supplied to the output node O1, to transistor N43B, to transistors N46, one or both of transistors N47 and N41, and back to output node O1, to thereby complete a second feedback loop. Applicants respectfully submit that such a dual feedback loop as recited in independent claims 1, 4, 8 and 12 is not taught or suggested by Pryor. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-6, 8-10 and 12 is respectfully requested.

Applicants also submit new claims 13-24 which further define exemplary embodiments of the dual feedback loop. Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are allowable for at least their dependency on independent claims 1, 4, 8 and 12, for the reasons set forth above.

CONCLUSION

In view of above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of claims 1-24 is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number listed below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Very truly yours,

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, PLC

By 
John A. Castellano
Reg. No. 35,094

JAC:jcp

P.O. Box 8910
Reston, VA 20195
(703) 668-8000